

## REMARKS

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claims 2 and 6 have been amended with this response. The amendments to claims 2 and 6 are fully supported in the application as filed and, thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow.

### 1. Rejections Based on Prior Art

#### a. Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 12-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,345 ("the Bloch patent") in view of Bruno U.S. Pat. No. 5,019,737 ("the Bruno patent"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because, as least for the reasons set forth below, the Bloch and Bruno patents, alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious each and every element which is called for in the claims. Therefore, reconsideration is in order and respectfully requested.

The Bloch patent discloses an electric motor 2 having a frequency converter 7 in a separate but connected chamber 13. In the Office Action, the examiner admits that the Bloch patent does not disclose a frequency converter having a structure where:

an external, first annular profile, and additional annular profiles are oriented to one another in relation to the axis of the first annular profile in such a way that the annular profiles surround each other with a distance from one another, transverse to a main axial direction of the housing, so as to form at least two annular chambers that act as cooling air ducts. *See* pending claim 1.

Contrary to the Examiner's contention, the Bruno patent does not overcome the deficiencies of Bloch. Specifically, Bruno does not have at least three annular profiles (i.e., one external plus *additional annular profiles*) arranged to form at least two annular (i.e., ring-shaped) chambers that act as cooling ducts. Rather, Bruno discloses only *one* annular chamber - the space between outer jacket 1 (the external, first annular profile) and inner jacket 2 (a second

annular profile). Together, this defines only a *single* annular cooling duct having a plurality of radial fins 3. Bloch, of course, does not disclose any annular chamber/cooling ducts.

In contrast to Bruno, and as clearly disclosed in Figures 3-8 of the present application, the present application calls for an external annular profile (16) and additional annular profiles (e.g., 36, 48) arranged in such a way as to create at least *two* annular chambers 40, 56. The first annular chamber, air inlet duct 40, directs cooling air past the outer radial side of a toroidal transformer core 60a-c. The second annular chamber, air outlet duct 56, directs cooling air past the inner radial side of the core 60a-c. That is, claim 1 requires that the frequency converter be constructed to have at least two annular cooling air ducts, one radially located within the other.

Thus, the Bruno patent, even when combined with the Bloch patent, fails to teach or suggest a structure comprised of at least two annular chambers that act as cooling air ducts. Thus, the combination of the Bloch and Bruno patents fails to teach each and every limitation required by the elements of claim 1. Claims 3-5, 9, 12-15 and 18-20 all depend from an allowable base claim and therefore are believed to also be patently distinct over the cited art.

For at least these reasons, the references alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest the frequency converter mechanism of claims 1, 3-5, 9, 12-15 and 18-20 and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**b. Claims with Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 2 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for such indication. Claims 2 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form and now include all the limitations from the base and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 2 and 6 are now believed to be in allowable form as indicated by the Examiner. Further, claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 16 and 17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 6 and likewise are now in allowable form as depending from an allowable base claim.

Response to Office Action dated May 3, 2007  
U.S. Serial No. 10/540,712


## **2. Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is submitted that Claims 1-20 are in compliance with 35 USC § 103 and each define patentable subject matter. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

No fees are believed due with this communication. Nevertheless, should the Examiner consider any other fees to be payable in conjunction with this or any future communication, the Director is authorized to direct payment of such fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1170.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by phone if questions remain after consideration of this response, or if such would otherwise facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy E. Newholm  
Registration No. 34,400

Dated: August 3, 2007

BOYLE, FREDRICKSON, S.C.  
840 North Plankinton Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53203  
Telephone: (414) 225-9755  
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753